REMARKS

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1 and 8 are amended herein. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-20 are rejected.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-20 are currently pending in this application.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 13, 14 AND 16-18 UNDER 35 U.S.C § 102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY CONNOR (U.S. PATENT 6,477,492)

Claim 1 as amended specifically recites, amongst other novel features, "**an autonomous VRU without any external I/O control**, performing a **port setup** and a **call control**". (Emphasis added). Connor fails to disclose, teach or suggest these features.

Instead, Connor discloses how the VQT platform 34 uses two signal nodes to interact with the VRS 12 under test wherein DTMF tones 44 are automatically generated by the signal generator node 36 and the returning VRS prompts 40 are automatically recorded by signal recording node 38. See, for example, column 3, lines 55-67 of Connor. In Connor, a telephone call is made to the VRS 12 using the VQT platform 34 wherein after a call is made, **a processor 35 uses a script file to direct the signal generator 36 to output the DTMF tones 44 that step through different states in the VRS 12 state machine.** See, for example, FIG. 3 and column 4, lines 8-12 of Connor. The purpose of Connor is testing the correctness and speech quality of VRS prompts using a Perceptual Speech Distortion Metric (PSDM). See, for example, column 1, lines 5-9 of Connor.

However, it is respectfully submitted that Connor fails to disclose, teach or suggest **an autonomous VRU without any external I/O control**, performing a **port setup** and a **call control**", as specifically recited by Applicant in, for example, claim 1. Instead, Connor merely utilizes a processor 35 and a script file, which are located outside the VRS, to direct different states in the VRS 12 state machine. See, for example, FIG. 3 and column 4, lines 8-12 of Connor. The feature of an autonomous VRU without any external I/O control, performing a port setup and a call control, is absent in Connor. Further understanding and appreciation for Applicant's claimed invention as recited in claim 1 would be found in, for example, page 4, paragraph [0015] of the specification of the present application.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences in claims 2, 5, 8, 9, 13, 14 and 16-18 over Connor.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3, 4, 6, 7, 10-12, 15, 19 AND 20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER CONNOR (U.S. PATENT 6,477,492) IN VIEW OF TOMBERLIN (U.S. PATENT APPL. 2002/0110153)

The above comments for distinguishing over Connor also apply here, where appropriate. It is respectfully submitted that nothing was cited or has been found in Tomberlin suggesting modification of Connor to overcome the deficiencies discussed above.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 8, 2006

By: _____

Uchendu O. Anyaso
Registration No. 51,411